



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ☐ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

### PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>Title:</b> Heritage Church	<b>Plus#</b> PMPA T20051104
<b>Description:</b> proposed to renovate the existing 2,500 sf office, a 900-seat multi-use sanctuary, parking, and landscaping; and to construct a 10,000 sf classroom and office space.	
<b>Location:</b> 1450 State Highway 193, Lincoln, Placer County	
<b>Project Owner:</b> Heritage Church, PO Box 747, Lincoln, CA 95648	
<b>Project Applicant:</b> Daron Anderson, Cormanleigh Communities, 4190 Douglas Blvd., Suite 400, Granite Bay, CA 95746 (916)780-2131	
<b>County Contact Person:</b> Leah Rosasco	530-745-3091

### PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **January 2, 2007**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Lincoln Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Zoning Administrator. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, at (530) 745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

Recorder's Certification

POSTED 11/29/2006  
through \_\_\_\_\_  
JIM McCAULEY, COUNTY CLERK  
By Attanson  
Deputy Clerk

FILE NO: 1043164 DATE: NOVEMBER 18, 2009



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • [www.placer.ca.gov/planning](http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning)

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

### A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: <b>Heritage Church</b>	Plus#: PMPA T20051104
Entitlements: Minor Use Permit, Type A	
Site Area: 20 acres	
Location: 1450 State Highway 193, Lincoln, Placer County	
Project Description: The proposed project of an integrated church facility would be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 would include the renovation and use of the existing 2,500 square-foot office, a 900-seat multi-use sanctuary contained within a 35,000 square-foot building, parking and circulation areas, and landscaping. Phase 2 would include the additional construction of 10,000 square-feet of classroom and office space. The existing pool on-site will remain.	

### B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan / Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	Farm, combining Building Site 20 ac min	Placer County General Plan	Existing 2,500 square-foot house used as office, existing swimming pool.
North	Farm, combining Building Site 20 ac min	Placer County General Plan	Existing single-family residence
South	Farm, combining Building Site 50 ac min	Placer County General Plan	Existing rock quarry

East	Farm, combining Building Site 20 ac min	Placer County General Plan	Existing single-family residence and agricultural accessory structures
West	Two parcels, City of Lincoln: Village Commercial & High density residential	General Development Plan for Del Webb Sun City Lincoln Hills	Under construction (northern parcel) Undeveloped (southern parcel)

### C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference can occur:

- ➔ County-wide General Plan EIR

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Planning Department, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

### D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanation to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
  - 1. **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - 2. **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - 3. **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**I. AESTHETICS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)				X
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)		X		

**Discussion-Item I-4:**

The proposed project would include parking lot lighting in the parking areas along the north and west portions of the parcel. There is a potential that lighting associated with the project could create a new source of light or glare that could adversely affect nighttime views in the area, however the lights proposed for the project consist of flat-bottom fixtures that direct light onto the ground. The purpose of the proposed lighting for this project is to provide adequate lighting to parking and circulation areas on-site and all lighting associated with this project will be contained on-site. Spillage of lighting associated with this project onto adjacent properties could result in a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

**Mitigation Measures-Item I-4:**

MM I.1 Prior to approval of improvement plans, the applicant shall submit lighting development standards for the project. The standards shall be reviewed and approved by the DRC and shall include General Lighting Standards, Parking Lot Lighting Standards, Prohibited Lighting and Exemptions and shall insure that individual fixtures and lighting systems for the project will be designed, constructed and installed in a manner that controls glare and light trespass, minimizes obtrusive light and conserves energy and resources.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (EHS, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)		X		
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)		X		
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)				X

**Discussion-Items III-2, III-3:**

This proposed project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standard and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. According to the project description, the project will result in an increase in regional and local emissions from construction and operation.

The project related short & long term air pollutant emissions will result primarily from diesel-powered construction equipment, trucks hauling building supplies, vehicle exhaust, landscape maintenance equipment, water heater and air conditioning energy use. Based on the proposed project, short-term construction and long-term operational emissions are not expected to exceed the District's significant thresholds. However, buildout of the project would contribute to the cumulative air quality impacts occurring within Placer County unless the following mitigation measures are implemented.

**Mitigation Measures-Items III-2, III-3:**MM III.1

1. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations.
2. No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements.
3. The applicant shall submit to the District and receive approval of a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking.
4. Minimize idling time to 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment.
5. Suspend all grading operations when fugitive dusts exceed District Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations.
6. The applicant shall use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators. If diesel powered generators greater than 50 horsepower are going to be used, a District Permit to Operate is required.
7. Use California diesel fuel for mobile and stationary construction equipment.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)			X	
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)		X		
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)		X		
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion-Item IV-1:**

The Biological Assessment prepared for the proposed project states that several stick nests were observed within oak trees on-site and in oak trees located on adjacent parcels. Active raptor nests are protected by Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Unless mitigation measures are incorporated, construction of this project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on species that are protected by the California Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Biological Assessment completed for the project site identifies 18 elderberry shrubs located along the southwestern portion of the quarry pond on the subject parcel. The majority of the shrubs are located substantially outside of the area to be affected by construction of the project, however a cluster of three elderberry shrubs are located approximately seven feet south of the carport overhang of one of the existing buildings located on-site that is slated for removal. The proposed project does not anticipate removal of the elderberry shrub, but unless mitigation measures are incorporated, activities associated with the demolition of the existing building could have a substantial adverse effect, through habitat modifications, on the federally listed Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.

**Mitigation Measures-Item IV-1:**

MM IV.1 Prior to any grading or tree removal activities, during the raptor nesting season (March 1 - September 1), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A report summarizing the survey shall be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) within 30 days of the



completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed and implemented in consultation with CDFG. If construction is proposed to take place between March 1<sup>st</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>, no construction activity or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or greater distance, as determined by the CDFG). Construction activities may only resume after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nest (or nests) are no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow up survey shall be conducted 2 months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between March 1<sup>st</sup> and July 1<sup>st</sup>. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the DRC, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFG. Temporary construction fencing and signage as described herein shall be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1<sup>st</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup> no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1<sup>st</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. A note which includes the wording of this condition of approval shall be placed on the Improvement Plans. Said plans shall also show all protective fencing for those trees identified for protection within the raptor report.

**MM IV.2** A twenty (20) foot setback shall be established from all elderberry shrubs. The only activity allowed within 20 feet of the shrubs would be demolition of the shed during a time when the beetles are not active. Any construction activities within this 20 foot setback area shall include the placement of protective fencing around the elderberry shrub prior to any demolition and the use of manually operated, non-motorized tools only.

#### **Discussion-Item IV-2:**

The Biological Assessment prepared for the project identified the annual grassland on-site as potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat that is greater than one mile but less than five miles from a known nesting site. Construction of the proposed project would reduce the amount of potential foraging habitat on-site. Unless mitigation measures are incorporated, the loss of annual grassland on-site could result in a potentially significant impact.

#### **Mitigation Measures-Item IV-2:**

**MM IV.3** Where off-site mitigation has been determined to be acceptable for compensation for impacts to Swainson's Hawk, the applicant or agent shall provide written evidence of compliance to Placer County Planning Department prior to approval of project improvement plans. Compliance with mitigation shall be to implement mitigation as follows:

Provide written evidence that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a State and/or Federal Agency qualified Swainson's Hawk mitigation bank or through the direct purchase of suitable foraging and/or nesting habitat in Placer County. The amount of money required to purchase credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace Swainson's hawk habitat acreage (pasture lands, grassland, alfalfa fields or other suitable foraging habitat so determined by Placer County and/or appropriate nesting sites) and resource values including compensation for temporal loss. The amount of habitat to be replaced is approximately 5.13 acres of foraging habitat. The exact amount of habitat impact shall be determined during the Improvement Plan process. The amount of habitat replaced shall be no less than the habitat replacement requirements of the State and/or Federal resource agency(ies) that have jurisdiction over the habitat. Evidence of payment, which describes the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site, must be provided to the County prior to issuance of Improvement Plans or Grading Permits. The amount to be paid shall be the in-lieu mitigation payment in effect at the time the Final Map is recorded or Use Permit is exercised.

#### **OR**

For Swainson's hawk impacts less than 20 acres, pay into the County's Swainson's hawk Fund. The amount to be paid shall be comparable to the in-lieu mitigation payment in effect at the time the Final Map is recorded or Use Permit is exercised. If mitigation credit costs are not available for comparison from an acceptable State and/or Federal Agency qualified Swainson's hawk mitigation bank at that time, the payment shall be determined based on the best available estimate (see Sacramento County's Swainson's Hawk mitigation ordinance) of the most recent or anticipated future costs of such credits. The amount of habitat replaced shall be no less than the habitat replacement requirements of the State and/or Federal resource agency(ies) that have jurisdiction over the habitat.

#### **Discussion-Item IV-3:**

According to the arborist report submitted by the applicant the site contains 132 oak trees comprised of three species; Blue Oak, Valley Oak, and Interior Live Oak. Construction of the proposed project will result in impacts to 19 trees, including the removal of seven oak trees and the impact to the protected root zones of 12 oak trees. Specifically, construction of the project will require the removal of seven Blue Oak trees, and impacts to the protected root zones of nine Blue Oak trees and three Interior Live Oak trees. The removal of and impacts to 19 trees will not have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands. This is considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item IV-3:**

None required

**Discussion-Item IV-5:**

The subject parcel contains multiple wetland areas associated with the riparian area along the northern boundary of the quarry pond and within the riparian area located in the southwestern most portion of the parcel.

A portion of the wetland area located in the southwestern most portion of the parcel runs north along the western parcel line and will be impacted by the construction of the southernmost driveway and improvements to Oak Tree Lane.

Additionally, the project includes the construction of a pedestrian pathway through the wetland area located along the northern boundary of the quarry pond, and construction of several buildings and an open landscape area within relatively close proximity to these wetlands.

Unless mitigation measures are incorporated, the project, as proposed, could result in significant adverse effects on the wetland and riparian areas on-site as a result of construction activities and permanent improvements to the site.

**Mitigation Measures-IV-5:**

MM IV.4 A fifty (50) foot structural setback shall be required from the edge of high-water mark of the pond, which is identified by the Preliminary Drainage Report as the water elevation at 193.7', and a thirty (30) foot structural setback shall be established from the edge of wetlands.

MM IV.5 A twenty (20) foot protection zone shall be established and monumented with post and cable fencing around all wetland areas north of the quarry pond on-site. No grading activities are to take place within the 20 foot wetland protection zone.

MM IV.6 For wetland areas impacted by construction, provide written evidence that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County-approved wetland mitigation bank. The amount of money required to purchase credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace wetland or riparian habitat acreage and resource values including compensation for temporal loss. Evidence of payment, which describes the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site, must be provided to the County prior to issuance of Improvement Plans or Building Permits which would result in the degradation or loss of the habitat. The amount to be paid shall be the fee in effect at the time the Final Map is recorded or Use Permit is exercised (for guidance, if the Map was recorded today, the fee would be \$49,000 per acre for permanent and seasonal wetlands and/or \$70,000 per acre for vernal pools).

MM IV.7 This project may be subject to review and approval by the State Dept. of Fish & Game, National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS), and/or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain such approvals, if necessary, prior to any grading, clearing, or excavation.

Prior to approval of Improvement/Grading Plans, the applicant shall furnish to the DRC, evidence that the California Department of Fish & Game, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS), and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (if applicable) have been notified by certified letter regarding the existence of wetlands, streams, and/or vernal pools on the property. If permits are required, they shall be obtained and copies submitted to DRC prior to any clearing, grading, or excavation work.

**Discussion-Item IV-7:**

According to the arborist report submitted by the applicant the site contains 132 oak trees comprised of three species; Blue Oak, Valley Oak, and Interior Live Oak, all of which are protected by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. Construction of the proposed project will result in impacts to 19 protected trees – comprising 532 inches – including the removal of seven oak trees, and the impact to the protected root zones of 12 oak trees. Specifically, construction of the project will require the removal of seven Blue Oak trees, and impacts to the protected root zones of nine Blue Oak trees and three Interior Live Oak trees. Unless mitigation measures are incorporated, the removal of these trees could result in a potentially significant impact by replacing valuable oak woodland habitat with site improvements that largely include the parking lot and circulation areas, but also include the construction of a building and various other improvements.

**Mitigation Measures-Item IV-7:**

**MM IV.8** The applicant shall mitigate for the removal of and impacts to trees on-site by replacing trees on-site at a ratio of three-to-one. Each removed or impacted tree shall be replaced with three, five-gallon native oak trees, preferably Blue Oaks and Interior Live Oaks. Prior to approval of Improvement Plans the applicant shall submit to the DRC for review and approval a Planting Plan that details the tree replacement, irrigation, and monitoring plan for the mitigation of impacted trees (including removal and impacts to dripline). In lieu of replacement on-site the applicant may mitigate impacts to up to 50 percent of the trees with payment into the Tree Preservation fund at a rate of \$100.00 per inch removed.

**Temporary Construction Fencing:** The applicant shall install a 4' tall, brightly colored (usually yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the DRC) at the following locations prior to any construction equipment being moved on-site or any construction activities taking place:

- 1) Adjacent to any and all wetland preservation easements that are within 50' of any proposed construction activity;
- 2) At the limits of construction, outside the dripline of all trees 6" dbh (diameter at breast height), or 10" dbh aggregate for multi-trunk trees, within 50' of any grading, road improvements, underground utilities, or other development activity, or as otherwise shown on the Tentative Map;
- 3) Around any and all "special protection" areas as discussed in the project's environmental review documents.
- 4) Around all Open Space lots within 50 feet of any development activity.

No development of this site, including grading, will be allowed until this condition is satisfied. Any encroachment within these areas, including driplines of trees to be saved, must first be approved by the DRC. Temporary fencing shall not be altered during construction without written approval of the DRC. No grading, clearing, storage of equipment or machinery, etc., may occur until a representative of the DRC has inspected and approved all temporary construction fencing. This includes both on-site and off-site improvements. Efforts should be made to save trees where feasible. This may include the use of retaining walls, planter islands, pavers, or other techniques commonly associated with tree preservation.

Said fencing and a note reflecting this Condition shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)		X		
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)		X		

**Discussion-Item V-1:**

The Archaeological Resource Inventory prepared for the project site identifies four historical resources: a circular concrete foundation, an earthen dam, a small granite quarry and bedrock milling feature, and a previously recorded isolated bedrock milling feature with a single shallow mortar hole. According to the Archaeological Resource Inventory the historical resources are not likely to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, nor are

they likely to qualify as a “unique archaeological resource” under CEQA. As such, it is not anticipated that the project will substantially cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. This is considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item V-1:**

None required

**Discussion-Item V-2:**

The Archaeological Resource Inventory prepared for the project site identifies four archaeological resources: a circular concrete foundation, an earthen dam, a small granite quarry and bedrock milling feature, and a previously recorded isolated bedrock milling feature with a single shallow mortar hole. According to the Archaeological Resource Inventory the archaeological resources are not likely to be eligible for any National Registry, nor are they likely to qualify as a “unique archaeological resource” under CEQA. As such, it is not anticipated that the project will substantially cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. This is considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item V-2:**

None required

**Discussion-Items V-3, V-6:**

The proposed project includes grading of approximately 50 percent of the subject parcel, the majority of which was previously undisturbed ground, in order to construct parking and circulation areas, a 35,000 square-foot sanctuary and additional associated improvements. Unless mitigation measures are incorporated, on-site grading activities required for the construction of the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**Mitigation Measures-Items V-3, V-6:**

MM V.1 If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a certified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X

5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				X
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				X
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

**Discussion-Items VI-2, VI-3:**

The project is proposed on an approximate 20-acre site at the southeast corner of State Highway 193 and Oak Tree Lane. The site topography is relatively flat. Grading will disturb a total of 5.84 acres (254,500 square feet) of the project site. The project involves cuts and fills up to 6 feet in height and an estimated 8,000 cubic yards of both cuts/fills to balance on site. Impacts associated with grading/earthwork will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures-Items VI-2, VI-3:**

**MM VI.1** The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the ESD for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

**MM VI.2** All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and ESD concurs with said recommendation.

All facilities and/or easements dedicated or offered for dedication to Placer County or to other public agencies which encroach on the project site or within any area to be disturbed by the project construction shall be accurately located on the Improvement Plans. The intent of this requirement is to allow review by concerned agencies of any work which may affect their facilities.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.

Submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion

of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

Any work affecting facilities maintained by, or easements dedicated or offered for dedication, to Placer County or other public agency may require the submittal and review of appropriate Improvement Plans by ESD or the other agency.

**MM VI.3** Submit to ESD, for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- a) Road, pavement, and parking area design
- b) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)
- c) Grading practices
- d) Erosion/winterization
- e) Special problems discovered on-site, (*i.e.*, groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)
- f) Slope stability

Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required for subdivisions, prior to issuance of Building Permits. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

**Discussion-Item VI-5:**

Minor grading will take place as part of this project for site improvements. Grading operations will cause soils to be exposed to water and wind erosion. Construction activities, without appropriate water quality Best Management Practices, have the potential to cause erosion and thereby cause water quality degradation from the site. These impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level by incorporating the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures-Item VI-5:**

**MM VI.4** Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the ESD for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off- site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to vegetated swales and preservation of existing vegetation, storm drain inlet protection, storm drain signage, proper drainage system maintenance, parking/storage area maintenance, good-housekeeping practices, proper building and grounds maintenance. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request.

**VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD, EHS)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (EHS, ESD)				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (ESD)				X
9. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)		X		
10. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)			X	

**Discussion-Item VII-2:**

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to the standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VII-2:**

None required

**Discussion-Item VII-4:**

The Heritage Church Expansion Project is located north of the former Beale Titan 1-A Missile Site (BTMS). The BTMS was in operation between 1961 and 1965. It is currently undergoing review and monitoring with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). The site now houses the Placer County Road Maintenance Division and a fire station. As the BTMS is currently being reviewed by the CVRWQCB, the impact for the project being located in the vicinity of a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites is considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VII-4:**

None required

**Discussion-Item VII-9:**

There is a large quarry pond, part of which is onsite, which has the potential to create breeding habitat for mosquitoes. This is an existing condition.

As part of the proposed Heritage Church development, a stormwater management system will be constructed and operated. This stormwater management system includes drop inlets, culverts, and detention facilities. This infrastructure may provide mosquito breeding habitat. The irrigation system that is part of the proposed project may also provide mosquito breeding habitat, if standing water is allowed to form.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VII-9:**

MM VII.1 The Placer Mosquito Abatement District (PMAD) will carry out routine surveillance for mosquito larvae and will maintain a population of mosquito eating fish (*Gambusia* sp.) in the pond. As a condition of this project, a vegetation management plan approved by the PMAD shall be implemented and all drainage facilities will be maintained free of vegetation and be designed to drain completely. Onsite irrigation shall utilize drip technology to minimize runoff and ponding of water.

**Discussion-Item VII-10:**

There is an existing swimming pool onsite which the Heritage Church plans to maintain. The swimming pool has an existing 6-foot high wrought iron fence and locked gate which prevents small children from entering into the swimming pool area. The project proponent plans to maintain the swimming pool in accordance with Placer County Environmental Health Services regulations for public swimming pools. Therefore, the exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards is considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VII-10:**

None required

**VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)		X		
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (EHS, ESD)		X		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		X		
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (EHS, ESD)		X		
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X



8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)			X	
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)			X	
10. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
11. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

**Discussion-Items VIII-3, VIII-4:**

Changes in the amount of stormwater drainage runoff will occur due to the increase in impervious surfaces with the development of site improvements (structures, parking areas, access road, etc.). The existing impervious area is approximately 3.4% and will increase to approximately 25% after development. The addition of impervious cover on site will lead to increased volumes of stormwater runoff and may potentially create a change in pre-project to post-project conditions. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff are expected. The direction of flow of surface waters across the property will change due to drainage conveyance across the parking lot. The potential impacts from this additional impervious area are considered to be potentially significant; however, incorporating the following mitigation measures will reduce potential erosion and water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures-Items VIII-3, VIII-4:**

MM VIII.1 Refer to MM VI.4 for the text of this mitigation measure.

**Discussion-Item VIII-6:**

The existing dwelling is currently connected to an onsite sewage disposal system which has the potential to degrade water quality. The project proponent proposes to connect to a public sewer system and the dwelling will connect to this system. The project proposes to properly abandon the onsite sewage disposal system under permit through Environmental Health Services. The impact for this project to violate any water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. (EHS)

**Discussion-Items VIII-5, VIII-6:**

Changes in the amount of stormwater drainage runoff will occur due to the increase in impervious surfaces with the development of site improvements (structures, parking areas, access road, etc.). The existing impervious area is approximately 3.4% and will increase to approximately 25% after development. The addition of impervious cover on site will lead to increased volumes of stormwater runoff and subsequent potential impacts to surface water quality. Activities from the projects operations include vehicle use and parking, erosion, and landscape maintenance. Potential contaminants that could enter into the storm water conveyance system include hydrocarbons, sediments, herbicides and pesticides. The potential impacts from this additional impervious area are considered to be potentially significant; however, incorporating the following mitigation measures will reduce potential erosion and water quality impacts to a less than significant level. (ESD)

**Mitigation Measures-Items VIII-5, VIII-6:**

MM VIII.2 Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary Permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

MM VIII.3 This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related

stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).

MM VIII.4 Water quality "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) shall be applied according to guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, or for Industrial and Commercial, (or other similar source as approved by the ESD). BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. Flow or volume based post-construction BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to vegetated swales and preservation of existing vegetation, storm drain inlet protection, storm drain signage, proper drainage system maintenance, parking/storage area maintenance, good-housekeeping practices, proper building and grounds maintenance. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. Proof of on-going maintenance for privately owned and constructed improvements, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request.

MM VIII.5 All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the ESD and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the improvement plans. ESD approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. Heritage Church is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs on all such improvements constructed on privately owned property.

MM VIII.6 All stormwater runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use.

**Discussion-Item VIII-8:**

The project site comprises of 124,000 square feet (2.85 acres) of existing wetlands. The project proposes an encroachment onto Oak Tree Lane at the southwest portion of the parking lot which is within the 100 year floodplain. The project's estimated impact to wetlands is 3,064 square feet (0.07 acre) for the proposed project. The City of Lincoln has requested, per the City of Lincoln General Plan Update, a 25-foot dedicated landscaping/Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian/NEV easement running the entire frontage of the Oak Tree Lane project site. The City's anticipated ultimate build-out on Oak Tree Lane may require this additional footage. With the Oak Tree Lane full build out per the City of Lincoln's proposed general plan update, the estimated impact to wetlands is 13,520 square feet (0.31 acre). The project's southern driveway onto Oak Tree Lane is considered to have a less than significant impact in the 100-year floodplain and existing wetlands.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VIII-8:**

None required

**Discussion-Item VIII-9:**

The project site comprises of an existing quarry pond (3.58 acres) in the southeast corner of the project. According to the preliminary drainage report dated July 14, 2003, under the dam failure analysis studied and assuming failure near the spillway, the flow will not raise the normal 100-year flooding water surface more than 0.09 feet within the proposed development area and 0.40 feet within the area upstream of the development to the pond spillway. This is considered less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item VIII-9:**

None required

**IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion-Item IX-2:**

The City of Lincoln has requested, per the City of Lincoln General Plan Update, a 25-foot dedicated landscaping/Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian/NEV easement running the entire frontage of the Oak Tree Lane project site. The City's anticipated ultimate build-out on Oak Tree Lane may require this additional footage. The easement is to be located outside the existing right-of-way already provided for Oak Tree Lane. The applicant has been advised of the requirement and has agreed to the easement. This is considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item IX-2:**

None required

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

**XI. NOISE** – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (EHS)		X		
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)		X		
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)		X		
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X

**Discussion-Items XI-1, XI-3:**

Noise from construction activities may noticeably increase noise levels above existing ambient noise levels. This is a potentially significant event.

**Mitigation Measures-Items XI-1, XI-3**

**MM XI.1** In order to mitigate the impacts of construction noise noted above, construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holiday, and shall only occur:

Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)

Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)

Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

In addition, temporary signs shall be located throughout the project (4' x 4'), as determined by the DRC, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations. This condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans and shown in the development notebook.

Essentially, quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well.

The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.

**Discussion-Item XI-2:**

The Heritage Church proposes an outdoor plaza venue. The outdoor plaza venue is intended to be used for special church-related activities such as outdoor weddings. The outdoor plaza venue will use an amplified sound system and as such, this is a potential significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item XI-2:**

**MM XI.2** In order to mitigate the impacts of the amplified sound system as noted above, a condition of the use permit for the church will limit their outdoor plaza venue activities to the following (as noted in the Environmental Noise Assessment by J.C. Brennan & Associates, dated April 6, 2006):

- The church will not conduct outdoor activities before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m.
- Outdoor amplified sound shall not occur more than 4 hours per day

**XII. POPULATION & HOUSING** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES** – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X

**XIV. RECREATION** – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

**XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC** – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

**Discussion-Item XV-1:**

This project has a cumulative impact on the transportation system due to its contribution to increased vehicle trips in the area. The project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees to partially mitigate the cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Access to the site is proposed via both State Highway 193 and Oak Tree Lane. The State Highway 193 access will occur at a location that already provides access to a residence on the site. This existing driveway onto State Highway 193 is located approximately midway between Oak Tree Lane and the access to Turkey Creek Golf Course which is about 600 feet east of the Oak Tree Lane intersection. The applicant proposes to remove the existing striping and restripe for a two-way left turn lane. The projects improvements onto State Highway 193 are within the jurisdiction of Caltrans. All work proposed and performed within the State Highway right-of-way must be in accordance with Caltrans' standards. The applicant will be required to dedicate to Caltrans 60 feet of right-of-way from the highway centerline along the project frontage.

The two Oak Tree Lane driveways are to be developed at locations that are about 420 feet and 800 feet south of the State Highway 193 right of way. The project includes road improvements to Oak Tree Lane to improve traffic circulation. The projects improvements onto Oak Tree Lane are within the jurisdiction of the City of Lincoln. All work proposed and performed within the City of Lincoln right-of-way must be in accordance with the City's standards. The cumulative impact can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures-Item XV-1:**

MM XV.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Placer Central Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

- A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code
- B) South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA).
- C) Placer County/City of Roseville Joint Fee

Church Phase I: 35,000 SF x 0.46 DUE/KSF x \$4,260.82/DUE = \$68,599.20

Church Phase II: 7,800 SF x 0.46 DUE/KSF x \$4,260.82/DUE = \$15,287.82

Pre-School: 50 STUDENTS x 0.24 DUE/STUDENT x 4260.82/DUE = \$51,129.84

**TOTAL FEES = \$135,016.86**

The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

**MM XV.2** Obtain an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans for frontage improvements and any work proposed within the State Highway 193 right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the ESD prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Provide right-of-way dedications to the State, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements. The Improvement Plans shall be signed by a representative of Caltrans prior to approval by Placer County.

**MM XV.3** Obtain an Encroachment Permit from the City of Lincoln for frontage improvements on Oak Tree Lane and for any work proposed within the City of Lincoln right-of-way. A copy of said Permit shall be provided to the ESD prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans. Provide right-of-way dedications to the City, as required, to accommodate existing and future highway improvements. The Improvement Plans shall be signed by a representative of the City of Lincoln prior to approval by Placer County.

#### **Discussion-Item XV-2:**

Previously, the City of Lincoln had conditioned another project to signalize the State Highway 193/Oak Tree Lane intersection. The traffic analysis for the Heritage Church project lists the signalization as one of the proposed mitigation measures. The applicant will address this issue with the agencies involved. Caltrans will make the determination of when a traffic signal is warranted at this location and will control the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection. The cumulative impact can be partially mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure.

#### **Mitigation Measures-Item XV-2:**

**MM XV.4** Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans by Placer County, the applicant shall provide calculations and pay the project's fair-share cost of the future traffic signal proposed at the State Highway 193/Oak Tree Lane intersection. The County would not participate in any cost sharing for this signal.

### **XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – WOULD THE PROJECT:**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new septic systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)			X	

5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (EHS, ESD)				X
8. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (EHS, ESD)			X	

**Discussion-Items XVI-5, XVI-6, XVI-8:**

The agencies charged with providing treated water, public sewer, and refuse disposal services have indicated their requirements to serve this project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts and no mitigation is required. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. (EHS)

**Discussion-Items XVI-2, XVI-6:**

The applicant is proposing to construct an 8-inch sewer line across the project's State Highway 193 frontage connecting to the 12-inch stub being constructed in Oak Tree Lane. This line will then connect to the 36-inch trunk line now under construction for the Bickford Ranch project. Due to the impending annexation of this area into the City of Lincoln, a public sewer line may be required to stub to the eastern property line and sized to accommodate future flow from the sewer shed area to the east. Final determination whether or not to construct this sewer line will be negotiated via an "Out of Town" service agreement with the City of Lincoln. The County desires to be a signatory to this future agreement. This is considered a less than significant impact. (ESD)

**Mitigation Measures-Items XVI-2, XVI-6:**

None required.

**Discussion-Item XVI-4:**

The applicant is proposing to construct three detention basins to mitigate the post-project flows to below pre-project flows. Therefore, the capacity of existing culverts is adequate because there will be no additional runoff. The final sizing and design of the detention basins will be addressed in the final drainage report during the improvements plans and will comply with both Placer County and The City of Lincoln's drainage requirements for this area. This is considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures-Item XVI-4:**

None required.

**E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X



3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X
--	--	---

**F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Lincoln
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

**G. DETERMINATION** – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

**H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, Leah Rosasco, Chairperson  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Janelle Fortner  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra  
 Department of Public Works, Transportation  
 Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller  
 Air Pollution Control District, Brent Backus  
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow  
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell  
 Placer County Fire / CDF, Bob Eicholtz

Signature



Date

11/28/06

Chairperson, Environmental Review Committee

**I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:**

The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Environmental Coordination Services, 11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance
<b>Trustee Agency Documents</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

<b>Site-Specific Studies</b>	Planning Department	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resource Inventory _____	
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> _____		
<input type="checkbox"/> _____		
Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Mosquito Abatement District	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	